

M2048
Monday July 26, 1971
New York
Group II
Grammar of Work, Tape 7 of 9

Mr. Nyland: So another meeting, another talk—conversation. Another discussion about what is important. Of course there are many things that are important in anyone's life. They change, sometimes day by day, sometimes after some years. The accent of one's life is on different things as you grow older. When we talk about Work, it is an important question for me; that's why I want to talk about it, and the reason why I really want to talk is that I hope that in talking you will also understand the importance of Work in your life. It does not mean that you have to agree with everything. Because I may make certain statements, or perhaps even clarification, where you cannot get along with it simply because ... because of not wishing to agree ... you have your own way of thinking and you feel about matters related to you and your life, your experiences in a certain way, and you have a perfectly good reason to think what you want to think. When you are a little confused in your thought, then it might lead to a question; but even then when the question may be answered, you may not agree with that kind of an answer—partly because it doesn't fit, and partly maybe because I'm not convincing enough.

It's always a difficult question: How convincing should I try to be. Because I have no particular interest to convince you, but I would like, when we talk about Work that there is a certain concept which gradually is unrolled for you, and you look at it and then it may have attraction. There may be certain things in it that fit into your life or that you wish to accumulate or assimilate, or to contain yourself with it or even to join, to some extent, parts of your life with such ideas. And when I talk about 'life,' of course I mean life that you are familiar with in the best form. Because life expresses itself in so many different kind of manifestations in the first place, and life also comes from different parts of oneself, of one's personality. They do not

always come from your brain. They do come from your feeling, they sometimes come as a result of instinct, sometimes as a result of intuition, and it may be just as a result that certain thoughts appear because of a reaction against the outside world, or a reaction in regard to other people. So we are not at all sure to determine ... to be able to say 'where' is this life that one wants to talk about—in regard to Work, where is it situated. I think it also moves; and at certain times in the day or in your experience, that kind of life that we really want to talk about, or could be touched, comes a little bit closer to the surface, is a little bit more vulnerable and perhaps is a little bit more wishing to accept conditions related to the description of Work on yourself.

That is all a personal affair; and therefore when one talks about different forms of life and then makes a distinction between an 'outer' life—mostly made up of the reactions towards the outside world and where a person, as a personality, starts to react in relationships with other people, or whatever his experiences are in this outside world—and we make a distinction then between that and what is really your own, and when it becomes more and more your own and sometimes even private ... remaining your own without wishing to talk about it, one starts to use a term of 'inner' life and it's only a distinction between a quality of that life as far as the manifestation is concerned. Because you cannot say that the kind of life which is expressed in an outside form should not be the same as that what is expressed in an inner-life form, and when we talk about Work we first talk about the form in which certain lives happen to be—in the form of manifestations of ourselves—in order to learn more about oneself and what one really is, and then to be able to see where these ideas should be placed.

I think the further you can place them inside of yourself—the 'deeper,' as it were, they can go and affect you—the better it would be. Because I don't think that the ideas themselves, particularly when they have to do with the possible development of oneself, are really very superficial. They belong to the beginnings of one's inner life, or they belong to an interest that one has in further development, or they belong to a relationship that one wants to establish with different forms of life, including those which are apparent on the Earth but also in a Cosmic sense may be represented by certain other forms on which one believes life could exist or, in a very general way, the life that one has within oneself in the most concentrated form and which one calls, then, one's own 'Magnetic Center.'

I think that Magnetic Center has to be touched once in a while as a realization that that is also life for which one is responsible; and where exactly this difference is between the outside

life, to which I react, and that what is within me and I call 'inner' life and then that I only can say it is more essential than the surface ... and where I will try to make a distinction between an essential quality and that what is a little bit more essential; and sometimes one says 'essentially' essence and then comes the Magnetic Center and the other day I used 'quintessence'—whatever it may be, where it will reach you depends entirely on yourself. It depends on the force with which that outside impression is created and it depends, of course, on the openness for yourself and, really, the question which you already have in wanting to have an answer to these ideas regarding your own life.

So for that reason it's logical that if we talk about ideas which may be 'life-giving,' that then the place where you should receive them—entirely being your own and of your own making—has to be such that they become as permanent as you could wish, and that you don't lose track of them tomorrow morning but that they will have a meaning which could last for you. Because you will remain dependent, on the further development of yourself, on that what has been told or said or what you have felt, or what you have realized as being important for you.

Now, on that kind of basis we should ask questions. Because it is for that kind of an inner life that we really want to understand our outer life. And it seems very strange that, for the sake of the development of inner life, we are dependent on outer conditions and outside life. And it is very simple why: Because we have much more familiarity with our outer world and with our reactions which are superficial, and we don't know very much about our emotional conditions within, and quite definitely we don't know very much about our essential-essence quality.

So we begin simply where it is the easiest to begin, and without making, then, a distinction between what is outside and what becomes inside. It's very much like an artichoke or an onion which you peel, where you don't know where you go over from that what is outside and what is inside. Because there is no sharp line. There is no frontier that you cross. But you do know that if you go further and further inside, that that what is then outside can be considered 'outside' if that's where you are, and where you reach, becomes 'inside.' And that we know simply in relationships; and therefore Work has to be placed as a relative value for your life which at times becomes very important for you and at other times is not as important as other processes which take place for your ordinary existence, and then many times you have to make a choice: What is it now that is important for me and what should I attend to; and particularly when it has to do with certain Work on oneself, how much time can I afford to give to this essential development

and to give in to my wish for further growth as compared to the possibility of functioning in the outside world, which requires a great deal of energy on my part and which I call 'professional' ... or by whatever name it happens to come to me, I have to attend to it.

In general we simply say there is a 'subjective' world and an 'Objective' world, but about the Objective world we don't know anything—not anything to speak of. Because even we say an 'inner' world, it still remains subjective for ourselves, and if I even dare to say that I reach that what is the central point of my life as a life-giving force and which I then call 'Magnetic Center,' I still have to conclude that it is a subjectivity which leads me there.

And also, what I uncover I will not recognize as Objectivity. You see, the concepts that are now involved become quite different. Because when I talk about an 'Objective' world, I have no experience of an Objectivity that I can trace and even could make. And when I become dependent on accidental happenings, I can then realize that there is something of that kind in existence; and also when I start to think about it, I can say that if there is a subjective world there ought to be also a 'non-subjective' one; or if I say there is a personality in which there is 'life,' there ought to be a possibility of life existing without my personality. And whichever way you want to philosophize, you do not define Work in that sense that it leads you to something you know. You go into an unknown region of your own development and your inner life as it is and whatever happens to be formed will not help you, and no amount of experiences of your inner life will ever touch Objectivity. Not even the voice of your Conscience; because even if your particular personality is made up of a great sensitivity and that there is at certain times a kind of a feeling, perhaps, which is a little bit unknown but nevertheless starts to speak to you and you call it a little 'voice' or you may call it even your 'instinct' or perhaps 'intuition,' or sometimes that what is a 'hunch' and comes to you and all of a sudden takes on a certain form of a word which you then hear—all of that is still subjective world, because there's no Objectivity at all in the terminology we use: 'Objectivity'.

I hope you're clear about the term Objective 'value,' because it's very difficult even to define it. To say that it is 'non-subjective' has, of course, no meaning whatsoever; because everything that I experience is subjective, and therefore when I say it is 'non-subjective' I should say it is 'non-experienced.' And I can say "Yes, when I die completely"—not only my physical body, but all the rest—"when I go into nothingness or the condition of Nirvana, then I can say I would experience Objectivity." But of course it is of absolutely no use to me even to

philosophize about it.

The advantage of Gurdjieff is that there is a possibility of realizing what may be meant. And don't try to make a mistake that—since we are so completely subjective, that it is an easy task to Work on yourself—and you have to realize more and more what you're up against. You are up against the totality of your subjective world. You're up against all the different forms of life which you have lived in 'unconsciousness,' as we call that. Unconscious, because we compare Objectivity with Consciousness. We have lived our life completely by the makings of a little conscience which remains subjective. We have lived our life as a result of certain ideas which happened to come over which you have no particular control and you call 'intuition,' as I said. Or sometimes one wishes to call it the 'voice of God,' but even that has no meaning whatsoever. Because, what is your God and to what extent even will that voice tell you about Work—nothing at all! Because the voice that comes is not communicated in the form of Objectivity. It is not spelled out by that little voice or an indication of your Conscience—that you have to do something in the direction of wishing to become free from yourself. And that much of that what we call 'sensitivity' for oneself and an experience out of this world which we every once in a while say in ordinary life, it is 'as-if' and then start to describe it—a great deal of that has nothing to do with Work itself.

And I make it as strong as that. Because Work; if you wish to understand it, it is not simply a little bit of an Observation process, and it's not a little bit of something that you say, "I want to create a little 'I'," and it is not even that you say this little 'I' has to do some Work for me so I ask the little 'I' to Observe me, but it depends at *that* point: What is this Observation process, and where is it where it starts to differ from the aspects of my ordinary personality which I call 'subjective.' With other words, where does Objectivity come in: Not in the Observation, because I use observation in ordinary life; and unless I want this word 'Observation' to mean something that belongs to Work, I have to introduce, in the first place, Impartiality.

Because, that is never told to me by God. You see, you may as well know that: God only is Benevolent, you might say, when it 'suits' Him and I interpret it that way. God is also cruel, but then I don't want to believe in Him and then I exclude such voices because I really don't trust them. And that is why the little voices—instinct and all the rest, including many times extrasensory perceptions—are so often colored by the channel through which they happen to

flow, that I cannot depend on them as giving me absolute truth. And this is the requirement for Objectivity: That that what is finally acceptable to me as truth is absolute, and I only reach absoluteness by the process of Observation when I introduce an Impartiality.

By 'Impartiality,' of course I mean that there is no further play—or introduction, or interference—on the part of my emotional center. I do not wish my emotions, in any form whatsoever, to enter into this intellectual process of an Observation, which should be pure-and-simple intellect. I can also say it the other way: If I emphasize the presence of the Lord, I don't want in that presence—which may be a result of my feeling—anything to enter that belongs to a description of the Lord; because I don't know, and I would really retard for myself the possibility of coming to a clear conclusion of what is meant when I start to describe such presences.

For the time being we stay, more or less, with the mental process of Observation and forcing it to Work by means of a wish. And in that way, of course, I straddle the issue. Because I introduce, then, a combination of part of my mind with part of my wish; and so I start to begin, in the beginning, to bring about a combination—a certain process of the two centers, which usually quarrel, into something as a common aim for myself—that a little bit of my mind should function in relation to that what I call my 'wish,' and that for the time being my wish is only interested in the functioning of that mental process in a certain way, without even entering into it.

This is what I call 'Impartiality.' The wish gives me the desire to do, the doing includes the Observation and Impartiality—that is, in order to keep the ordinary feeling, and even emotions, out for the time being. So you might say for a little while, even, part of my inner life is not there; until I start to accept that what I then Observe by means of this little 'I'—and this time functioning—accepts it as a fact of my life, then I try to see to what extent I can eliminate my feeling by the total acceptance of what this little 'I' Observes; and when that process is most successful, I then realize that the only time by which I can exclude my feeling is when that what is the process is being Observed by means of the little 'I' and the object which I am myself, that that what takes place as an activity is recorded at the same time that it takes place.

We talk, now, first about the elimination of other centers when it is none of their business to enter into the process which involves a little bit of my mind in a special way functioning, a little bit of my feeling wishing to go in the desire for Work, and the totality of my physical body, which I don't have to divide because it does not play any particular part in the functioning of my feeling or my mind.

I wanted to make these things clear before we start talking. Because it is a question of a general knowledge in which any question you ask, all the time must be referred to the basic issue of Work, and when I say you have to 'Work on yourself,' I want to make sure you understand what is meant by it and that you are not going to mix it up with functionings of your inner life. The inner life will grow as a result of Work, and then it will become a real inner life, completed as much as the world around you and the Earth and your capacity will allow; and only will continue to live when more freedom is gained by a Man as a result of his Work on himself, that he starts to understand the requirements of his body and knows where to place his body and his personality in relation to this process of evolution.

I've spoken already too long, I'm afraid, but please let me hear what you want to say and we'll try to attach it to that. I say again, that what I've said is general information which is underlying any kind of an answer that I might give.

Yes, I saw an arm up there.

Bernie Carneol: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yes.

Bernie: Uh, it's Bernie Carneol? Uh...

Mr. Nyland: Yes. Oh, didn't we ... last time, didn't we leave it at the person who was going to ask? Didn't I say that the person could have the privilege of asking first? Who was that.

Gene Salerno: She's not here, Mr. Nyland.

Mr. Nyland: Huh?

Gene: She's not here.

Mr. Nyland: She's not here? Was she afraid? All right. Then, Bernie, go ahead.

Bernie: Over the past several months, uh, my wish has been getting weaker and weaker, where at this time I find it very difficult to apply Work as I have understood it up until now. And I can't seem to figure out a way to pull out of this.

Mr. Nyland: Do you ... are you sorry that that wish is diminishing?

Bernie: That's another part of it. I'm not that upset that it's diminishing. I ... that's the part that's...

Mr. Nyland: Would it be very difficult to come to the conclusion that Work has no meaning for you?

Bernie: No. That, I don't accept that.

Mr. Nyland: You don't accept that yet.

Bernie: No.

Mr. Nyland: You have fear that you might in the future, if you continue this way? You see, when it is a losing game, I think a person gets afraid that he might lose it altogether. If you don't believe in that—or if you think you won't lose it in any event, or that you feel that it is just a down-going line which will come up again—then I think you have it in your own mind ... in your own power to be able to let the line go up. But that naturally depends, again, on the wish which you have at the present time to try to find out something about Work. And if you can remember your original motivations of why you became interested, or the motivations which you still have—that you say you're a little *less* interested—what is it actually then that compels you at times to think about it, and perhaps make an attempt? Or, realizing that it is a little less than before and what creates then in you a certain condition of sorrow.

Where is your wish. Why do you want to Work.

Bernie: In the beginning it was very clear why it was. When I first came upon the ideas of Work it was a true revelation of a certain kind that I never experienced before because of the ideas.

Mr. Nyland: But, what actually did you experience. What was the revelation.

Bernie: Well, it was the first time I actually sensed there might be a possible way to change the direction my life seemed to be going in.

Mr. Nyland: Have you changed it?

Bernie: A little bit, I think.

Mr. Nyland: Are you satisfied with it?

Bernie: That's... A little bit. Not really, but a little bit.

Mr. Nyland: Do you still want to change a little more?

Bernie: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Why don't you, then.

Bernie: I can't seem to get any intensity...

Mr. Nyland: Nonsense.

Bernie: ...in the wish.

Mr. Nyland: Nonsense. If you say that, what is true—that you want to change it a little more—you will Work.

You see, there is no way in between. Either what you say is true and then you Work

because you know what Work means—you know what you should do, you have done it before—so you can do it again; and the fact that you don't do it means that you really don't have that wish anymore. Maybe you are satisfied. Maybe the direction is a little bit straightened out and now you don't want to do any more, or you hope for a momentum that has been established so that from now on it's roses, roses without any further attention.

Try to be much more strict about yourself. Because what you say at the present time is nonsense. Either "Yes," or "No." There is no other question about it; either I realize that I want to do something about myself ... I go ahead and do it. That I may have difficulty in doing it is quite a different thing from not having the wish. It's quite possible that I realize I ought to do something and the wish is there, and then there may be an impossibility or some kind of an obstacle in the way. Then we can talk about that. But when there is no wish, there is absolutely not any realization for yourself that you ought to—and surely, who will tell you that you should.

You understand what I mean.

Bernie: Yes, I do. I...

Mr. Nyland: Think about that a little bit, because this is no question. It's just a simple statement of 'nonsense,' as I call it.

All right?

Bernie: Yes, I [inaudible]...

Mr. Nyland: I'm afraid you have to accept it, because that's the only truth.

Bernie: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Revise it. Maybe in the next ten minutes you have a wish.

Bernie: But I still have a wish, every now... I mean, it does come.

Mr. Nyland: When! When! When!

Bernie: Certain times, all of a sudden.

Mr. Nyland: Then wait for that certain time.

Bernie: It's just that they get less often.

Mr. Nyland: Okay. You tell yourself, "I have now only ten wishes to the square mile and it used to be hundred." Make a statement, see if you are satisfied with it. I'll give you a task: Stand in a mirror ... in front of a mirror and tell your face that you have less and less desire, and look your own eyes in your own eyes. Will you?

Bernie: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: And say it.

All right?

Bernie: Yes.

Douglas Oberwager: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Douglas: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yah.

Douglas: Douglas Oberwager.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, Douglas. Oh, yes! [laughter] No particular hilarity, than only that I remember that you and I walked out last time, and then I started to accuse you of not having asked a question. Do you remember?

Douglas: Yes, I do.

Mr. Nyland: All right. Good, Douglas. Tell me.

Douglas: Listening to what you were saying just now, I would say I have trouble with Impartiality as far as when I'm Working and trying to be Aware. After a point there is a caution within my, uh, solar plexus or heart where I must...

Mr. Nyland: Douglas, don't make it too complicated.

Douglas: All right. I must understand...

Mr. Nyland: Tell me first where that point is.

Douglas: Yes, sir.

Mr. Nyland: Tell me where that point is. You say "after a point." What happens before the point. [no response] Because you said you were Working and it was all right up to a point, and then afterwards you start to talk about solar plexus and the heart and so forth.

Douglas: Yes. Ah, I'll make it a little bit clearer.

Mr. Nyland: Yah. So, what happened before the point.

Douglas: Okay. I would attempt Work, or to try to be Aware. After a certain amount of time...

Mr. Nyland: A little more than that, still. We are now ordinary human beings, unconscious. Right?

Douglas: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: I get an idea that I ought to Work. The thought happens to come, what do I do.

Douglas: Well, I try to be Objective or...

Mr. Nyland: No. Wait, wait.

Douglas: Yes

Mr. Nyland: That is only a word. What do you do. A little while ago I said nobody knows anything about Objectivity, so you cannot use...

Douglas: That includes myself, too.

Mr. Nyland: You do what?

Douglas: I... Yes, I do not know about Objectivity.

Mr. Nyland: No, that's right.

Douglas: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Yah. What do you do.

Douglas: When I make a Work attempt?

Mr. Nyland: Yah, also that you have to define. What is that. Let's say...

Douglas: Well, I try to see myself in a state of Awareness. But after...

Mr. Nyland: No, wait, wait, wait, wait. I'm very fussy. When you say, "I try to see myself in a state of Awareness," you're all wrong.

Douglas: I'm what, sir?

Mr. Nyland: You are all wrong!

Douglas: I see.

Mr. Nyland: You want to see yourself.

Douglas: Well, I'll define it a little clearer then. I try to be Aware of myself; it's a mental state.

Mr. Nyland: Good. Which is ... which part, or what is Aware.

Douglas: Something in me in a state of Awareness is different than that which is known as Douglas most of the time.

Mr. Nyland: No. No, no. No, no. Not necessarily that. It is functioning differently from usual in your mental process. Is that right?

Douglas: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: How did it get there. Why does it want to function.

Douglas: Because I want to be Aware.

Mr. Nyland: No.

Douglas: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Is it... What is actually that 'I' that you say; that wants to be Aware of what.

Because now you're mixing it up with the Awareness that is *going* to take place. Because you cannot say I want to be Aware. What you mean really is, "I want something to exist that could be Aware."

Douglas: Yes, sir, that's better.

Mr. Nyland: Right. So you have to make it.

Douglas: Yes, sir.

Mr. Nyland: How do you make it.

Douglas: By wishing with all my Being that I can do this, and...

Mr. Nyland: Does that create it?

Douglas: I don't know. I just keep trying...

Mr. Nyland: No.

Douglas: ...and trying, until I will if I possibly can.

Mr. Nyland: That won't satisfy me.

Douglas: Well,... [laughter]

Mr. Nyland: Because, you see, there is a heavy block—it's a rock or so—and I keep on trying and trying and trying to lift it up but it doesn't happen, so nothing happens. In this particular process I want something to happen, which means I have to have this little 'I' which I call then 'Objective faculty' created by me.

But, what actually can take place before I have it, in order to make it. When you say Work 'effort,' where does it start.

Douglas: It starts with a desire not to be...

Mr. Nyland: That's right. It starts with a desire—to do what.

Douglas: Not to be a slug. I ... I do not wish to go along in life asleep. I wish to be Awake.

Mr. Nyland: That's right. That is the result you hope to achieve.

Douglas: Yes, sir.

Mr. Nyland: But that's not a description of the effort. You hope that if the effort is successful, that you will be less a slug.

Douglas: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: That's right. But what do I do. Because you ... you do not cross that bridge yet.

Douglas: There is an attempt to be Objective...

Mr. Nyland: No...

Douglas: ...in a state of Awareness.

Mr. Nyland: No, wait. Again I ask: What is Objective.

Douglas: That which is truth regardless of what I feel.

Mr. Nyland: No. Where is the truth located. Sure, it should ... it should lead to truth—that's right. How do I make it.

Douglas: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Nyland: How do I make it.

Douglas: Well, could I use terms that are ... are not... I hate to use terms that are not of the Work, but...

Mr. Nyland: No you used...

Douglas: ...I can't define...

Mr. Nyland: Oh, yes. Use ... use any term.

Douglas: Well, there's something inside me that ... that I never wish to violate, which is an inner something that, on verification and in my life I have found to be more Objective than Douglas, and using this, I attempt Awareness...

Mr. Nyland: Yah, I agree.

Douglas: ...which to me is Objective...

Mr. Nyland: I can see that. But do you think that that part that you now wish to use, is that reliable enough to give you information, that it actually will give you the truth?

Douglas: Not totally. No.

Mr. Nyland: No? Then it is not useful...

Douglas: No.

Mr. Nyland: ...unless that is changed.

Douglas: That's correct.

Mr. Nyland: You see, it is exactly what I said a little while ago: That what may be an inner value within oneself—sometimes, and I have said, like a 'voice,' or that what you know to exist, and every once in a while one becomes aware, really aware of such existence—then you want that to do some Work for you or give you information.

Douglas: Yes, sir.

Mr. Nyland: And now it depends on what... The kind of information it will give, on that will depend if it is truthful or not. You see, we have to define truth. What is truth for me.

Douglas: Are you asking me?

Mr. Nyland: Yah. For us in general, what do I call 'absoluteness.'

Douglas: Well, I have a feeling that truth for me is just a path, that it's not total Objectivity. I follow this truth in me towards total and whole...

Mr. Nyland: Yes.

Douglas: ...Objectivity.

Mr. Nyland: That may be so. Then it could be a relative truth. But how do you know it will lead to absolute truth.

Douglas: Oh, well, my questions... Uh, I ... I question this all the time. My question if ... when I finish, would be to... [laughter]

Mr. Nyland: No, no, it is all right. Is that your question: How that relative truth could become absolute?

Douglas: Well, it would be a good question. [laughter]

Mr. Nyland: I'm not putting a ... I'm not putting a question in your mouth. [laughter] I'm trying to find out, what is there as a question.

Douglas: I'm willing to follow your lead, sir. [laughter]

Mr. Nyland: No, no. I'd almost say, then we have something to talk about. [laughter] No, but come back to where you were. It's quite right, because we can start from there. Something within you that tells you and you want to follow it, and it is something unusual and it's not like the ordinary Douglas. But, will it give you what you really look for. You would have to determine what you're looking for, and if that is what you said a little while ago—truth—then I can tell you, you don't reach it. You will reach relative truth, but no absolute truth.

Because you don't know how to define absolute truth. Absolute truth is freedom; in a mathematical sense, of all dimensions; in a physiological sense, of all influences of other centers which are not intellectual, where ... if truth is registered in one's intellect. When truth is registered in what you call your 'heart,' it also has to be free from the interpretation of your mind. But whatever that definition of truth is, I don't expect to reach that but I want to go in the direction of it. And therefore, that what I want to follow as a road has to be tinted already by the aim that is in my mind, or in my heart, that I ultimately wish to reach.

Now, the question of creation of little 'I', about which you don't talk, is exactly the necessity of that what then could function in an absolute sense as principle and gradually give me

information about myself which also gradually could become absolute truth.

Is that it, Bill?

Bill: Yes.

side 2 Mr. Nyland: Yah. Do you understand that, Doug.

Douglas: Yes, sir.

Mr. Nyland: You are saying that you, totally, would like to reach truth. If you try to analyze that what you really mean, it means simply that you would like to utilize your present machinery to reach truth, that then that machinery would start to function in a truthful manner. If you know yourself well enough, you know that there is no machinery in you which is not subjective. And subjectivity as a whole, belonging to a personality, will never give you the truth; it will give you relative truth; it will never give you God, it will give you only your little God. It will never give you what you aim at, unless you change a certain possession of the mind into another kind of a possession where it starts to function in a different way. And this is what we mean by the 'changeover' between a thought process and an Awareness process; and the process that actually is followed is a process of going up a step, and not like sometimes evolution is indicated—as an ordinary line which goes upward and only has an angle with a horizontal line.

For that reason, it is necessary to create something which is not of this Earth and has not the attributes of this Earth, and has the requirements which I call 'Objective' value; meaning by that that I don't want any subjectivity in the form of dimensions either as space or as time, and I don't want any of the functioning, physiologically, of an interference of one center with the other. And, that last statement is extremely important. Because if I want an absolute fact, I want such a fact to be a fact of truth without associations whatsoever, and I cannot believe that my mind, as it is at the present time functioning, will at a certain time just all of a sudden go over into an Objective-functioning mind.

You ... you follow that.

Douglas: I do.

Mr. Nyland: Now, it is necessary to understand the functioning of the mind as it is and that what is in the mind as potentiality. Because on that Work is based, the same way as when I consider my feeling I also have to consider the potentiality of my feeling.

Regarding the feeling, that what I call 'solar plexus' and the combination of the nerve nodes over the rest of my body, is not sufficiently capable of having a true emotional state.

Because it also functions by associations and it also functions mostly by an expression by means of my physical body, so it is far from free. When I talk emotionally, or as a direction for a solution for myself, I change and try to indicate that the place for the feeling, which is now in the solar plexus, should move to a place reserved for my emotion which I call my 'heart'; and that then the heart starts to function, also besides taking care of the blood circulation that it becomes the central point of the next level.

But you see, there is a distance between my solar plexus and my heart, and there is no direct road. As far as the mind is concerned, we do believe that ultimately the mind could start to function in an Objective sense. But when the mind is left to its own, it is so filled with associations and based on memory and based on anticipation of events, that there is absolutely no possibility, within the mind as it is now, to change over into, as it were, a 'different' kind of a level of functioning, and only a tremendous shock could give this mind a different rate of vibration in the mental functioning. Now, of course it can happen that sometimes an event is so powerful that the mind changes, but we say often that the mind then becomes 'crazy' and is not suitable anymore for the Earth.

The problem that we face, being unconscious as we are, is to see where we are, in its potentiality, most vulnerable. And I have explained that if the solar plexus could move to the heart, it would be very useful for emotional states. As far as the mind is concerned, I know that there are certain sections in the mind which are not functioning and still have mental capacity. I know even, by study of the mind itself, that many departments of the mind can function very well and also in relation to each other. But I have to call them *all* 'subjective' functionings, and that there are a few places where there is the possibility of an out-growing of that mental capacity—if the conditions were created for a further development of that. I've talked about it many times as if it is like a factory which has been closed up and where the machinery is not running and is rusty, that by some means or other a door could be opened and the factory could be started in its way—this time in an Objective sense—functioning. And by that, of course, I mean that when the Objectivity enters into my mind, that then the mind is entirely free from any influence from the feeling and any influence of the mind itself surrounding that particular place where the little factory is starting to operate.

I've talked so many times about it, and undoubtedly you know it and you may have heard some tapes in which I started to explain more in detail. But that, after all, is the principle; so

when I now say I wish that I could be ‘Aware,’ my real meaning is that that part of my brain that is not yet functioning correctly—or has been reduced to an almost non-functioning state—that that could be set into motion and then start to function and become Aware of that what I ask it to become Aware of.

I don’t know if you understand really the process of Work, because you get stranded on saying that I want to be Aware. Even if you will admit that there is something else that ought to be Aware, you have no clear vision of what is meant by it, and you fall into the trap of believing by just continuing to think and to feel in a right way—in a very noble way, and kind, and an inner-life way—that then ultimately you will reach another kind of a state. And I’m sorry, you won’t—not in this lifetime. Something has to be introduced which is entirely different and which only can be reached by the consideration of the verticality of the next step—when you want to go from one step to the other—and the vertical direction means that where I come from, I leave subjectivity and where I want to go to is reaching an Objective level. One step is different from the other, although they are connected. But they are not connected by a straight line. Say it a little differently: When the verticality is the line which goes up, that what is the normal process of a horizontal line absolutely stops, and it only continues when the height of the verticality has been reached for a new level.

I do not know if you know enough about chemistry or physics, but when you have a substance that boils or melts at a certain temperature, the idea of the temperature—that is, when the melting point is a certain number of degrees—that what is before the melting point is still solid, and after it is liquid it is a different phase; it’s a different kind of a condition, and although it can be reached by the application of more and more heat, at the melting point the heat does not go higher; it stays at that point until all the solid has been changed into all liquid, and then the temperature rises again. And it is exactly that particular point—where the temperature stands still—where the difference in phase is reached, and only when the phase is completed—that means the solidity is gone and the liquidity is the new phase—that then the ordinary process, even of life, can continue.

Look at this development of the little ‘I’ in that way. The little ‘I’ wants to become Aware of me. I make it. I mean by that, I try to set certain things in motion which are now potential and for which I sincerely wish to create certain conditions in which this little ‘I’ could start to function. Physiologically, again the result of such a wish is the opening up of certain glands in

my head which are not functioning anymore, but used to. The pineal gland is one of them, and because of that ... and the secretion of that gland enables the little places above the temples in the head to start to function in an Objective sense. That is what *actually* takes place.

You see, when I wish to create a little 'I', it is that my wish should go to the possibility of changing the potentiality into the actuality of a mental activity, and it will take quite some time before this mental activity has reached a certain maturity. And it will take much more time before the mental activity, which is now Objective, can affect the surrounding—that is, that what is also mental in my ordinary brain—to help my ... the ordinary brain, the rest of my brain to become Conscious.

But those are long processes. The principle that is involved is that you have to be very careful in the use of your words, of what you really mean. And when you say I 'Observe,' it has to be preceded by a very definite desire to create something that actually can Observe, and the maintenance of that as a little 'I' is very difficult to maintain unless you continue to wish for that. And the separation of energies, and the things that we have talked about in the last two or three weeks—and also what has been talked many times by the Nucleus in answering some of the questions—you can theorize a little bit about it, but what is needed is the actuality of the creation.

It is not the thought, and it is not the hope that the thought automatically will go over into an Awareness. It won't at all. It will stay a thought. Because as a thought, it is bound to the associations of the mind. You have to become quite free from that, and the only way is to create something, as it were, from the 'ground up' which is virgin field, and that that what is above the temples in one's head is then actuated and then starts to function in an Objective sense. Because my wish, trying to keep this little 'I' also pure ... purely intellectual, and only later whatever happens to the little 'I' afterwards and whatever further functions are needed in connection with the process of Observation and Awareness—those are all further development leading, ultimately, to the possibility of a Man to become either free or harmonious, or whatever the ultimate aim may be.

You understand this now, Doug.

Douglas: Yes, I do. I have a question when you're finished, sir.

Mr. Nyland: Yah, ask.

Douglas: From what you say, I'm not sure right now of anything, but if I ... if I hadn't ... if I had

made attempts and they were successful, I... When you say keep the intellect 'pure,' it is almost impossibly difficult for me to do this; not because of associations, but because there is a ... it's a very cold, uh, period of time if you ... you do this. And I must ... although something comes from my ... my emotional region where I must check it, or try to understand it within myself before going further. Because it is like ... it doesn't have ... it's not in contact with something else in me that I value.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, I agree.

Douglas: And that would be my confusion.

Mr. Nyland: Yes, *that* I agree with. But I said a little while ago, it has to start with a little part of my mind and a little bit of my emotion. Don't forget that your ordinary life continues, and that you simply will have to have energy for that continuation. There is very little energy in the beginning that will go in the emotion ... in the direction of Objectivity ... but that doesn't mean that that what starts to exist will already take over the functionings that you would like. You would want emotional states to continue to exist, and they will continue to exist—only, I say, 'unconsciously.' You would want your mind to function, and again I say it 'remains unconscious.' You're not eliminating your ordinary life, but in the presence of your ordinary life you create something that ultimately will be able to take over.

In the beginning, it is a cold something that you do make which starts to function. Because you want to dress it in the simplest forms you can in order not to fall into a trap of ordinary unconsciousness, for that reason it has to be cold as a fact of pure intellect. But as soon as the coldness is sufficiently established as a function there will have to be added an emotional quality, exactly the same as when a child grows up and it is only a body, that after some time—and the body perhaps being formed in the womb of the mother—that after some time different organs start to be formed. They're not all at the same time. They come after a little while—and after a little while when the rest of the body is ready for it.

When the little 'I' first has the ability to Observe in the sense we mean it, it can take on, as it grows older or becomes more mature, different functions belonging to that kind of little 'I' in the particular attributes that I also wish it to have, which is an emotional quality which I say, every once in a while, is expressed in the form of 'Benevolence.' If I compare the possibility of that what exists as little 'I' with making it or creating it in the image of God, then there are also the different attributes of God which should be in the little 'I' and ultimately should become

apparent. God, I said a little while ago, is ‘cruel,’ but God is also Benevolent. He is kind, and sometimes He is completely filled with anger. And it is a question for me: What is this little ‘I’ going to do when it once starts to grow and comes to maturity. To what extent then can I count on the little ‘I’ existing for me for a definite purpose for which I created it. And the ultimate aim is, of course, that it will help me, as I am now, to change over into something else because of the presence of that what is of a higher level.

You understand.

Douglas: Yes, I do.

Mr. Nyland: You must create something that is not your own and about which you may wish it to be different, but it won’t be different. The little ‘I’ in creation is like a scientific fact which is not subject to any interpretation on the part of the scientist; that’s why we say, sometimes, ‘cold facts.’ But, I must have them first as a foundation before I can put an elaborate house on it. And in the house I can make comfort and hang all kind of curtains on the windows, and I can heat it up with a stove—that’s a different affair. I’m talking now—and we are most of the time—talking about what is the foundation of rock on which I can build the possibilities of a Kesdjanian body and a Soul body. That would be the ultimate aim if I want to pursue truth in its ... in its real sense.

All right, Doug?

Douglas: Thank you very much.

Mr. Nyland: Good, Doug.

Yah. What is this white arm that is sticking up?

Chris Coles: Chris Coles. It’s my arm.

Mr. Nyland: Huh?

Chris: It’s ... it’s my arm.

Mr. Nyland: Yah, good.

Chris: I’m ... my name is Chris Coles, and I’m very new to the Group. And, uh, I want to ask, uh... You mentioned that, uh, you believe that God is filled with anger.

Mr. Nyland: No, I didn’t say that. He is at times angry.

Chris: I see. But my comment on this, or my question would be: Certain religious people speak of ‘dwelling with God,’ and they mention that this as something that is eternally peaceful, it seems to me. And how could this be possible if God were at times filled with anger.

Mr. Nyland: It depends what kind of a God they talk about.

Chris: Well, many of them say that God is just one God and that all the different religions...

Mr. Nyland: Yes, I know. That's what they say. Do you say that too?

Chris: I don't know. I'm inquiring into various forms...

Mr. Nyland: But are you inquiring for the other people or for yourself.

Chris: For myself.

Mr. Nyland: Good. What is your idea of God.

Chris: Well, my idea is that, uh, if God is frequently filled with anger there would be no point in my...

Mr. Nyland: No, you don't have to take my word for it.

Chris: All right. I don't know. [laughter]

Mr. Nyland: You know, if I hear something that ought to be and I don't like it, I make something that I think ought to be, and then I like it.

Chris: I know that I have anger, but in the case of myself when I'm angry—as I frequently am, mixed in with different kinds of feelings—that is an unpleasant feeling and that it, ah, causes turbulence and suffering; and perhaps this is because I don't release it, or if I do release it in the wrong way, or perhaps I shouldn't release it—I don't know. In, in any case, it doesn't, uh, give me a good feeling.

Mr. Nyland: Yah. So, you shouldn't have it. Or, you would like to get rid of it.

Chris: Uh, I think I'd rather get rid of it.

Mr. Nyland: Well, why don't you ask your God.

Chris: Well, uh, I don't have one that I can speak to, because...

Mr. Nyland: [chuckle] You mean to say you're not on speaking terms? [laughter]

You see, if I consider myself the way I am, I'm quite certain that I ... particularly in memory I do know what I have been, and I think there are many times that I dislike myself heartily. I think that when I live ordinary life and have relations with different people, and so forth, that I at certain times am quite obnoxious; or that I have thoughts which I wished I could control but I haven't been able as yet; when I look at myself and I walk, and sometimes walk aimlessly; or if you are a housewife and you are in the kitchen, how often you go from the stove to the icebox for nothing.

But you see, many times those kind of things happen to an ordinary person and it includes,

simply, anger and sometimes a lot of other things—joy, maybe; or satisfaction; or a little vanity; or a little bit of jealousy and all the different things that belong to an ordinary human being as long as he lives on Earth—and I think all of us are familiar with it. I do believe that when you see certain things that you don't like, you have to consider first why is it that you don't like it. Because it may be that you like it, but you say that you don't like it because your father or mother told you that you should not like it. Are you quite sure about what you see of yourself, that that is a reality; or is it a form of an association based on quite early experiences, which of course are part of you because you have acquired them, but are they really, to some extent even, essential values.

You see, the question of God doesn't really enter very much, than only if one wants to do it afterwards in order to give it perspective. But for the time being, I believe that a person can walk on the Earth and earn a living without ever thinking about God. It's only at times when he feels that there is perhaps what he calls an 'inner' life, or that he has to have certain thoughts and feelings in a direction of a religion, or that he feels that if there is a religion, that then as a guide he—for himself in his life—he may be able at times to conquer his ... his anger, or overcome certain other qualities of himself; and that I think that the person who wants to feel at home with God and, as it were, have 'peace' in His arms, all he has to do is to exclude all other thoughts and simply assume that if his God is there, he can be peaceful. And after a little while the association will be enough, and as soon as he mentions the word 'God' for himself or happens to think about it, he thinks about peace and it produces in him a peaceful state.

I think we are very foolish, of course. I don't think that we are quite clever in knowing what actually takes place in the thoughts and the feelings of ourselves. But, I think that is the kind of machinery we are, and a human being cannot be held responsible for that kind of an artificial influence of the outside world on him if he is, actually, incapable of digesting it sufficiently.

Have you read anything about these ideas in some way or other?

Chris: Yes, I have. I've read In Search of the Miraculous and Meetings with Remarkable Men.

Mr. Nyland: No... Good. If you know In search of the Miraculous, you know the question of a mechanical Being, of a machine.

Chris: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: What do you expect of a machine. I think some are angry machines, and some are

lazy, and some are clever like a computer; but, all kind of varieties under the Sun, and whatever one is oneself and you see that ... and Ouspensky says you are a machine, do you believe him?

Chris: I did.

Mr. Nyland: You do, or not.

Chris: Yes, I believe it.

Mr. Nyland: Still, at the present time?

Chris: Uh, yes, I believe that. Yes—at the present time.

Mr. Nyland: Yah, good. And do you like to be one?

Chris: Uh ... well, I have many conflicts in my personality which are part of this mechanical nature. To say that I 'liked' or 'didn't like' it would be to say that I'm in conflict, and I am, uh, dissatisfied in various ways...

Mr. Nyland: No, it has to go deeper than that; because if you realize you are a machine, it's absolutely impossible to do anything about it.

Chris: I know. But then one also says, "Well, within this machine, the mind of the machine, the way one thinks as a machine ... and so perhaps there's nothing else except this mechanical nature which goes on forever and then ceases."

Mr. Nyland: That is why I say: Do you like it.

Chris: Well, I don't like it, but I don't like it from the point of view of somebody who is offering an alternative. Because then I would simply believe in that instead ... uh, I would believe in that as part of a machine.

Mr. Nyland: Now wait a minute. If I have a tie on and it is warm, I take it off. You know, it is within my means of doing that. Now, if I know that I am a machine and I don't like it because at times I see that I am mechanical, I have a very good reason to hope that someday I should not be, or even to question the advisability of keeping to be a machine, or perhaps even I rebel against it.

Chris: But this word 'machine' is ... is just an analogy, anyway.

Mr. Nyland: No, no, no, no, no. That is where you make a mistake. It's not an analogy. It's a reality.

Chris: But the machine means that it has been created by somebody and it functions in a certain way...

Mr. Nyland: Yes.

Chris: ...and makes a certain product.

Mr. Nyland: I think you have been created also to function in a certain way. Yes, I think that human beings on Earth have been created for a very definite purpose, not at all the purpose that they sometimes think or what they would like. I think that practically no one wants to accept the purpose for which they have been created. No one wants to be a pawn of Mother Nature. No one wants to be considered that they exist in order to be a kind of a converting machine for certain Cosmic food to go from one place to the other. I don't think that a human being, really if he thinks about it, likes it or even can be satisfied, and I don't believe that if he actually realizes what is taking place, that he wants to consent to it.

You've heard about sheep and being shorn, and mutton and wool and the shepherd? And you've heard about a black sheep who doesn't accept the position of the other white sheep, and becomes 'black,' as it were, because he has a different idea? You understand those concepts?

Chris: Yes.

Mr. Nyland: Well, I would say think about it: What are you, a white sheep or a black one. Because there's no question, you belong to the herd—everybody does. I would ask you to read All and Everything if you're really interested in Gurdjieff. Don't stop at Ouspensky. And in Remarkable Men you can read something about Gurdjieff as a person but it was written for a different purpose, and All and Everything is really to make you understand what *you* are.

I hope you have interest to do that.

Chris: I'll do that.

Mr. Nyland: Yah. It's something that you do first.

Richard Cohen: Mr. Nyland?

Mr. Nyland: Yah. Yah, go ahead.

Richard: My name is Richard Cohen, and I was at the meeting at the Barn last Thursday night and your answer to the second-to-last questioner, um, confused me about a number of things in terms of my approach to Work. Um, he had mentioned that he made two kinds of attempts; one where he set aside a very special time—like stopped driving the car and he got out and made a Work attempt—and another kind where he tried to Work in the midst of his regular activity. And ... and you suggested to him that he stop the first kind of attempt because it was, um, sort of like trying to put a good foot forward or with expectations involved; and do things like try and Work in the midst of putting on his clothes, or cutting his food or whatever. And that confused me in a sense because, according to my understanding I was under the impression that when

involved in ordinary life, um, you're a little too identified to be able to try and create something special, and that a special time when you're doing nothing else would be more conducive to attempting that.

Mr. Nyland: Would it confuse you now very much if I suggested to you that you should stop on the road every once in a while? [laughter] See, then you have absolutely nothing to say to me almost, because you can agree with it. It might even undo your confusion, and let's hope it'll do you some good.

Richard: Um, well...

Mr. Nyland: I have no objection, you see.

Richard: Uh-huh.

Mr. Nyland: You see, the aim for a person is, whatever the conditions may be, that he has then at that time the proper attitude towards Work, and almost any kind of a condition can be used by any kind of a person, theoretically speaking. In practice, of course, it isn't so, and sometimes I would suggest that what I think is right in order to keep the purity of the attempt. Now, if that isn't necessary and a person has within him the ability already that it is necessarily going to be pure, and if one becomes confused when I say that certain things should not be done for such-and-such a reason and you don't agree with me—all of that difficulty is removed by simply saying, "I'm going to do what I want, because my attitude towards Work is quite different than his." And in the end it doesn't make any difference whatsoever because each moment is absolutely the same compared to another moment as a moment; but the conditions in which the moment happens to be and expressed in the terms of time as a second is, of course, dependent on where time, as it were, 'manifests,' and it depends also on what I consider, at a certain time, conducive enough to experience the moment of an attempt.

So, I would not worry too much about him. You know, moreover it was not your question—it was his—and it does not mean that all the questions as asked can be answered with the same answer for everybody. I think in the beginning it's very necessary to ask the question, "Does that apply to me also." And many times when a certain task is given which is not general, do you ask yourself, "Is that suitable for me." And if you don't know it, you say, "Can I use that task?," and the answer has to be, sometimes, "No."

Richard: Um, in regard to that same answer that you gave him, I'm wondering if another certain part would be applicable to me or not; and that was, you mentioned also to have little 'I' take a

picture of you when you, uh, hate yourself.

Mr. Nyland: Do you hate yourself many times?

Richard: Sometimes I am, uh, displeased. I wouldn't say ... I don't know ... I couldn't say...

Mr. Nyland: You wouldn't say 'hate.'

Richard: No.

Mr. Nyland: You think such a moment of displeasure is worth taking a picture?

Richard: I think that if it ... I guess that's what I want to know. [laughter]

Mr. Nyland: Will it help you?

Richard: I guess it can if it makes me realize what I am in a certain situation and maybe the need to do something about it.

Mr. Nyland: I think it's right: If the picture if you ever developed it you could look at it impartially, it would be helpful. So, take a picture as you go along.

Richard: Well, then when you say little 'I' takes a picture...

Mr. Nyland: No, wait a minute. We don't go into detail about that. The next question would be, does little 'I' have a Kodak. [laughter]

All right? We'll let it go at that, and your question for next week... All right, also yours. Because I hear that little instrument.

Yes, Bill? Is it all right? Will we stop, Bill?

Bill: I think we should. [laughter]

Mr. Nyland: He's the engineer and I have to follow what he says.

So, goodnight tonight, and see you next week, I hope. Goodbye.

End of tape